

**Minutes**  
**HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD**  
**Rieger Room, City Hall**  
**1101 Poyntz Avenue**  
**Monday, March 27<sup>th</sup>, 2017**  
**4:00 P.M.**

**Members Present:** Cameron Tross and Suzanne Orr, Chair Chris Banner, Betty Mattingly-Ebert; Craig Hager; Eileen Meyer, Vice Chair; and Kevin West.

**Members Absent:** Craig Hager.

**Others Present:** Patrick Schaub, BBN (Applicant); David Miller, MOD (Applicant); Linda Glasgow; Sarah Fisher; and Phil Anderson.

**Staff Present:** Ben Chmiel, Planner.

1. Consider the minutes from February 27, 2017 meeting.

West moved to approve the minutes as written. Banner seconded. Motion passed 6-0.

2. Major Review Applications.

Chmiel presented the proposal for the rehabilitation of 222 S. 6<sup>th</sup> Street (unnamed) in the Houston-Pierre Historic District. The project proposed an extensive rehabilitation of the dilapidated Free Classic variant of the Queen Anne style house built in 1900. Interior modifications included the demolition of interior walls to open the first floor space. Some second floor walls were also proposed to be demolished to combine two bedrooms into a master suite. As well, a floor overhanging a portion of the stairwell and front entryway was proposed for demolition to open up the stairwell. Some wall structure and flooring structure was to be rebuilt and shored to regain structural integrity of the building. Interior finishes would also be updated to reflect a more modern aesthetic, however, the basic arrangement and function of spaces would be maintained. Proposed exterior modifications included shoring up the porch structure; replacing existing windows with double-hung windows; removing non-historic door surround and recreating a transom window; replacing non-historic Masonite siding with 4" concrete board lap siding; and expanding an opening on the west (rear) façade for egress to an exterior concrete patio.

Chmiel explained common character-defining features with Queen Anne houses and how the house contained many of those features. Miller explained that there was originally a transom window over the front door that would be restored. He also noted the bay window chimney to be unoriginal to the building, though there was no proposal to remove or alter it. Banner asked what windows would be replacing the existing. Miller explained that they would be replaced with double-hung case windows and siding 4-inch

concrete lap siding would be installed similar to other projects he'd completed at 314 S. Manhattan and 1005 Poyntz Avenue. He also explained that the replacement columns on the porch would be rectangular. The existing columns were noted as being non-historic. Miller explained that the porch would be shored-up to compensate for settling over time.

Mattingly-Ebert asked if the fish-scale shingles would be repaired or replaced. Miller explained that the structure behind it may not be in good enough condition to repair, but replacement is possible. Miller explained that there was an addition to the north side of the house, likely in the 1950s. Tross noted there was no delineation between the addition to the house and the original work. Chmiel explained that the interior changes were mostly opening up the space through the removal of walls including the creation of a master suite on the second floor. Miller noted it would be ideal if the large window on the porch were one large picture window and that the non-functional/non-historic shutters would be removed. Tross asked if the underlying siding would be removed, if it would become a contributing structure, and if so, would the proposed interior alterations hurt its potential to be contributing. Chmiel explained it was possible that the building become contributing if the original siding were restored, however houses in the area were judged contributing or non-contributing based only on their exterior appearance. As well, the proposed interior modifications largely maintained basic form and function of the original, so it would not have any effect unless perhaps a state or national nomination were pursued in which case documentation and determination are subject to higher scrutiny. Tross asked if there should be some delineation between the original structure and the 1950s addition on the north side of the house. Miller explained that the original intent of the addition was to be seamless and creating a delineation now would have a negative impact. Chmiel explained that delineation can be created through contrast in size, scale, and location as well as material. And in this case the addition appears subordinate to the original structure, being small and only one story, and isn't necessarily the reason for the building's non-contributing status.

Mattingly-Ebert asked if the stair baluster could be salvaged. Miller explained that it was in too poor of a condition. Miller further explained that there are a lot of structural concerns with the house and it will have to be re-framed in a lot of places. Banner asked how the ceiling heights would change. Miller explained that reinforcing the floors would push the ceiling down in some areas.

West stated that the primary concern for the review was for the exterior alterations. Tross agreed, but emphasized the opportunity to bring a historic homage to the building through the proposed improvements. He believed the proportion of the proposed siding and the retention of the fish scale shingles would contribute to that. Fisher asked what the dimensions of the porch columns would be. Miller explained that he would prefer minimal material, though capital trim could help flesh out the columns and make them more substantial. Tross posed concern about the proportion of the columns to its base as well. Miller explained it was not his intention to celebrate the column with more mass than structurally necessary. Tross had no concern with the detail of the column so much as the proportion and girth of the column. He further noted that the example provided at 1005 Poyntz seemed to minimal to use in this project. Miller agreed.

West moved that the proposal met the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as reviewed in accordance with K.S.A. 75-2724 and would not damage, destroy, or diminish any historically significant property or historic character-defining features, with the conditions of (1) the use of rectangular columns on the porch and (2) that the extant fish scale shingles be repaired or replaced to create a similar detail to the existing. Banner seconded. Motion passed 6-0.

Chmiel then presented the project for minor interior modifications to the Italianate Revival style church rectory building at 624 Pierre Street in the Houston-Pierre Street district and site of the Seven Dolores Catholic Church, listed on the National Register of Historic Places. First floor modifications included the demolition of a wall separating the kitchen from the current parlor room (southeast room) to create a connected kitchen and dining space; demolition/replacement of various cabinetry and appliances throughout the kitchen and current dining room (proposed sitting room); removal of the secondary staircase on north side of building; and removal of French doors and widening of opening separating the current dining room from the proposed parlor (west of the stair hall). No exterior modifications were proposed.

Banner noted that the majority of the original plaster in the building was likely gone. Schaub agreed and noted that any removal of wall material would be replaced with drywall. He also noted that there were many modern finishes, appliances, and cabinetry that would be removed.

Second floor modifications include the removal of walls surrounding the stairwell and replacing it with a recreated bannister; moving the bathroom access for the northeast bedroom; demolition of upper hallway walls to open up the space and create a laundry closet; and the construction of new closets for the northeast and northwest bedrooms to fill in the secondary stairwell space on the north side of the building. Finishes and spaces throughout the building were altered over time and little to no historic material remained.

Schaub noted that the original floor plans were available and that is what the plans are helping return the building to. He also noted that the back bedroom on the ground floor was originally a sleeping porch.

Meyer moved that the proposal met the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as reviewed in accordance with K.S.A. 75-2724 and would not damage, destroy, or diminish any historically significant property or historic character-defining features. West seconded. Motion passed 6-0.

### 3. Updates and Announcements.

Chmiel announced that the Sunset Area Survey grant proposal was submitted to the State Preservation office and that grant awards would be announced in early May.

Chmiel noted that the Floral Hall Nomination KHSBR hearing would be at 9am on May 13, 2017 at 6425 SW 6th Avenue, Topeka. Similarly, the Landmark Water Tower KHSBR meeting would be on August 12, 2017 at the same time and location.

4. Upcoming Meetings.

- Monday, March 27<sup>th</sup>, 2017.
- Monday, April 24<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

5. Adjourn.